

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 9, 2007, the drawings and Specification were objected to; claims 23-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; claims 1-3, 23, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0065950 (Yarborough); claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0019689 (Fan); claims 4-19, 24-26, 28, and 29 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. Yarborough in view of Fan; claim 22 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fan in view of Yarborough; and claims 20 and 30 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yarborough and Fan in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0112076 (Rueda).

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

Fig. 1 was objected to based on the label "121" for the "client application." The Specification in ¶ [0014] has been amended to refer to "client application (client) 121" to correspond to Fig. 1.

Fig. 2 was objected to because various items were not labeled. Applicant has added labels to Fig. 2B to address the objections.

Therefore, withdrawal of the drawing objections is respectfully requested.

Appln. Serial No. 10/800,828
Amendment Dated January 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed October 9, 2007

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Specification has been amended to address the objection. Therefore, withdrawal of the Specification objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Independent claim 23 has been amended to address the § 101 rejection. Claim 23 now recites an article comprising a machine-readable storage medium that comprises instructions that, if executed, cause a server computer to perform the various recited tasks. As noted by the Office Action, “an appropriate medium and/or hardware” should be claimed “to establish statutory category of invention.” By reciting that the instructions if executed cause a server computer to perform the various tasks, it is respectfully submitted that this requirement by the Examiner has been satisfied.

Therefore, withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Independent claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Yarborough. As disclosing the task of “providing ... the client with a decoy port number,” the Office Action cited ¶ [0010], lines 24-25, of Yarborough. This passage of Yarborough refers to a new IP address and port number for a data channel that is transmitted by an FTP server to a passive FTP client program. The new IP address and port number for the data channel that is referred to in this passage of Yarborough refers to a data channel that is created in response to a request from the FTP client program received at a command channel by the FTP server. Importantly, note that the new port number that is transmitted to the FTP client program by the FTP server is actually the port number of the data channel that is used for exchanging data packets. Thus, the port number provided by the FTP server to the FTP client program is **not** a decoy port number. As recited in claim 1, the services provided by the server computer to the client is on a second port having a second port number that is **mapped to the decoy port number**, where the second port number is **different from** the decoy port number. In contrast, Yarborough teaches that the port number of the data channel transmitted to the FTP client program is the same port number at which data is to be transferred. Thus, Yarborough fails to disclose providing a decoy port number to a client, where the decoy port number is **different** from a second port number at which services to the client are provided.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is not anticipated by Yarborough.

Independent claim 23 was also rejected as being anticipated by Yarborough. Claim 23 has been amended to indicate that the server computer transmits to the client computer a decoy port number that is an **invalid** port number. Moreover, claim 23 recites that a server application in the server computer is to be launched at a second port that has a second port number mapped to the decoy port number, where the second port number is a valid port number.

In Yarborough, the new port number of the data channel that is transmitted to the FTP client program is a **valid** port number on which data is to be exchanged. Therefore, the FTP server of Yarborough does not send to a client application a decoy port number that is an invalid port number, as recited in claim 23.

Claim 23 is thus not anticipated by Yarborough.

Independent claim 27 was also rejected as anticipated by Yarborough. Amended independent claim 27 now recites that a server application transmits, to a client application, a decoy port number that is an **invalid** port number. Such a concept is clearly not disclosed by Yarborough, as discussed above in connection with claim 23. Therefore, claim 27 is also not anticipated by Yarborough.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to incorporate subject matter of former claim 22. Former claim 22 was rejected as being obvious over Fan in view of Yarborough. As conceded by the Office Action, Fan fails to disclose a routine that, if executed, is operable to provide the client with a decoy port number that maps to the second port number. 10/9/2007 Office Action at 13. However, the Office Action cited Yarborough as disclosing the claim feature missing from Fan. As discussed above, Yarborough fails to disclose or hint at the provision of a decoy port number that is an **invalid** port number. In fact, Yarborough teaches that an FTP server sends a **valid** port number to an FTP client program to enable exchange of data in the corresponding data channel.

Thus, even if Fan and Yarborough can be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination of Fan and Yarborough would not have led to the claimed subject matter. Therefore, claim 21 is non-obvious over Fan and Yarborough.

Independent claim 9 was rejected as being obvious over Yarborough in view of Fan. As conceded by the Office Action, Fan fails to disclose providing a client with a decoy port number. 10/9/2007 Office Action at 13. However, as discussed above in connection with claim 1, Yarborough also fails to disclose providing a client with a decoy port number that is **different** from a second port number at which services are provided to a client.

Therefore, even if Yarborough and Fan can be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination of Yarborough and Fan would not have led to the claimed invention. Claim 9 is thus non-obvious over Yarborough and Fan.

Independent claims 15 and 17 are allowable over Yarborough and Fan for similar reasons as stated above.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. Moreover, in view of the allowability of base claims, it is respectfully

Appln. Serial No. 10/800,828
Amendment Dated January 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed October 9, 2007

submitted that the obviousness rejection of dependent claims 20 and 30 over Yarborough, Fan, and Rueda has also been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (200315498-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

Jan 9, 2008



Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883